

Meeting Date and Time: Monday, January 25, 2022 1:00PM - 2:00PM

Meeting Location: This meeting was via Microsoft Teams and Room 118 at 317 Academy Rd. Pittsford, VT 05763.

Members Present: Roger Marcoux, Jon Murad, Steve Coote, John Federico, Justin Stedman

Members Absent: Tammy Boudah, Tom Mozzer

Others in Attendance: Lindsay Thivierge, Chris Brickell

Call to Order 12:25PM

No additions or deletions to agenda Approval of prior meeting minutes

Motion made by Roger Marcoux, second made by John Federico, all approved.

Update on PT: The Academy transitioned to the Rower and for the first entrance test there were a total of 13 candidates from agencies and there was only one failure. Current standards after discussion with Texas DPS would be the 2000 meter row at 40% with continuous evaluation to ensure injury rate does not change. A run will still be incorporated into fitness program in academy.

Discussion was had around who point of contacts throughout the state would be and per department. Roger Marcoux will reach out to Greg Hammond at Concept 2 to see where the Rowers are available in the state (gyms, etc.) so people can have access.

Lindsay will send a survey out to agencies

Jon Murad will send to VACOP and a set of procedures to ensure agencies and candidates understand that this would be a one time visit to try the rower, must come with a recruiter, security and access protocols, as well as COVID safety.

Discussion was had around instructors for the PT test. Not required must only be AED/CPR certified.

Update on Written Entrance Test RFP:

RFP is live and available throughout the State as well as on VCJC website RFP page.

MMPI Logistics Discussion: While trying to craft language some additional information was requested. Discussion was made around the possibility of billing back to agencies. Is it the entity hiring that gets the information, the Academy administers the test and only has knowledge of who has taken it not the results. Create a client relationship with the vendor and have an independent contract between each vendor and the Academy and agencies.

The vendor delivers to the State and there is some level of performance that is not acceptable, possibility of creating carveout language that says if an agency does not want to use the vendor they have to do A, B, and C. Conversation continued—Is it mandated that this vendor is used? Do Agencies have the ability to opt out with stipulations? What are we trying to set as a standard?

Do candidates have the right to appeal the results of the psychological test?

Could the appeal consist of a 1:1 sit down with a psychologist? How is this done and who pays?

Is there some kind of scale for psychopathy. ETWG would recommend or vendor would recommend a required instrument for uniformity with X results.

Redacted examples of a psychological were shared with the group.

Group agreed that we should cast the net wide and then filter what we hope for.

Motion to adjourn Justin Stedman, 2nd by John Federico. All in favor adjourned at 1:35 PM